UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BOXABL INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01213-RFB-NJK

Order

[Docket Nos. 58, 59, 68, 71, 87]

JONATHAN GARMAN,

Defendant(s).

Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion to stay discovery pending resolution of his motion to compel arbitration. Docket No. 87. The Court ordered that any response had to be filed by July 8, 2024. Docket No. 85 at 1; *see also id.* at 1 n.1 (reminding counsel that, pursuant to Local Rule IC 3-1(d), the deadlines set in that order controlled regardless of whether CMECF automatically generated any different deadlines upon the filing of the motion). To date, no response has been filed, so Plaintiff consents to the granting of the motion to stay discovery. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d). Moreover, the standards for staying discovery pending resolution of a motion to compel arbitration are relatively permissive and "[c]ourts frequently stay discovery pending resolution of a motion to compel arbitration." *Arik v. Meyers*, 2020 WL 515843, at *1 (D. Nev. Jan. 31, 2020). Upon reviewing the motion to compel arbitration and the opposition thereto, Docket Nos. 80, 90, it appears that the governing standards are met in the circumstances of this case, *see Arik*, 2020 WL 515843, at *1.1

Accordingly, Defendant's unopposed motion to stay discovery is **GRANTED**. In the event the motion to compel arbitration is denied, the parties must file an amended joint proposed

¹ The Court conducts its preliminary peek without any intent to prejudice the outcome of the underlying motion, so it declines herein to provide an extensive discussion of the merits of the motion to compel arbitration or the opposition thereto.

discovery plan within 14 days of the issuance of such order. In the interim, the pending discovery motions (Docket Nos. 58, 59, 68, and 71) are **DENIED** without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: July 11, 2024 Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge